

REMARKS

By the above actions, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, & 12 have been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is now requested.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, as noted in paragraph [0022] the darkening device comprises "louvers 20" and reference numeral 20 can be found in Fig. 2 at the right side thereof. It is submitted that this showing should be sufficient to comply with the requirements of Rule 83, particularly given that darkening devices with louvers are well known and are shown for use with vehicle sunroofs in the Clenet patent cited by the Examiner. Therefore, withdrawal of the objection to the drawings and the requirement that they be supplemented are hereby requested. However, should this objection be maintained and be the only obstacle to allowance of the application the Examiner is hereby authorized to change "louvers" in claims 5 & 11 by Examiner's Amendment to either --at least one louver-- or --a louver arrangement--, with respect to either of which Fig. 2 should be an adequate showing.

All of the claims have been rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the Bohm et al. patent when viewed in combination with the Clenet patent. Withdrawal of this rejection is in order for the following reasons.

That is, the teachings of Bohm et al. ('864) and Clenet ('899) are that the glass pane is attached (cemented) directly to frames that are in turn attached to the vehicle frame, the pane (5) and guide elements (27) of Bohm et al. being foam bonded to frame elements (2-4) which are in turn attached, via cement (8), to the rabbets (6) of the vehicles roof elements which border the roof opening. Clenet, like Bohm et al., teaches a similar configuration of frame elements (92, 94) to which the glass pane (28) and guide elements (40) are attached which, in turn, are attached to the vehicle frame elements bordering the roof opening. Furthermore, neither patent teaches mounting of a darkening device directly to the glass pane, no do they teach doing so for the support brace that carries a motor drive for driving the darkening device.

Accordingly, no reasonable combination of the teachings of the Bohm et al. and Clenet patents could lead one of ordinary skill to the invention disclosed only in the present

application and defined by the claims as now presented. Therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection under § 103 is hereby requested.

The prior art that has been cited, but not applied by the Examiner has been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since this art was not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to apply against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon are believed to be warranted at this time.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900
401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington D.C. 20004

Telephone: (703) 827-8094

DSS/kmm

NVA301480.1